

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, January 12, 2017
10:00 AM - 11:30 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-452-3288
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 11217#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Jonathan Bearup
Julie Dybas*
Christopher Hale*
Donald Jacobson*
Jeff Mangis
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Nancy Rodriguez
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

Alexis Allen, *Tempe Municipal Court*
Randy Smiley*, *Phoenix Muni Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Phillip Knox
Rona Newton
Ron Overholt
Janie Randall

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Cathy Clarich, *CSD*
Summer Dalton, *CSD*
Tina Hladik, *ITD*
Marretta Mathes, *CSD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Kat Nguyen, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

CACC MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The chair confirmed that a quorum existed before he requested consideration of the minutes from the November 17 meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2016 CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

Judge Pollard shared the outcome of discussion about project monitoring that took place at the November 18 Commission on Technology (COT) meeting. The goal remains to obtain direction from COT regarding the appropriate scope of project monitoring by CACC.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Stewart detailed the many changes made on the MindMap since the November meeting, passing along what information he had received from those project managers who were not present for the meeting. Many date changes have taken place since November and several tasks had detail added. Members were provided the updated priority projects listing for reference.

DETAILED PROJECT REVIEWS

Judge Pollard invited Jim Price to kick off the detailed project reviews under the category “Enhance Core Systems” as decided in the November meeting. Jim focused attention on the status of the various civil case e-filing-related projects now underway at superior courts and completion dates for their major tasks. He emphasized that e-filing will generally follow eBench adoption in AJACS general jurisdiction (GJ) courts. Jim shared that all sub-projects except eUniversa e-filing Yavapai Superior Court are in the test phase and listed project dependencies on AJACS, nCourt, ACES [the front-end of the central case index (CCI) and central document repository (CDR)], and population of central case index information for Pima and Maricopa GJ courts. Jim indicated that development activities in the e-filing and case management system (CMS) will be ongoing, though his e-filing project ends at production readiness.

Jeff Mangis provided the chair with a list of issues caused by a new software build for Yavapai Superior Court that caused the court to decline the upgrade. The rejection may have an impact on Mohave’s implementation date. Jeff also decried a press release issued by the Supreme Court without any knowledge of the local clerks that sets premature dates for e-filing adoption in Yavapai and Mohave counties.

Summer Dalton shared project details about eBench, the facility that provides view-only electronic access to case data and documents in all case types. Development efforts and testing have completed and a year-long rollout to GJ judges and staff around the state is now underway. She reviewed a list of features pertaining to cases and documents pulled from AJACS and OnBase. The application is highly dependent on data coming from CCI and documents coming from CDR. The chair requested to hear from a judge at Mohave Superior about using eBench day to day. Kip Anderson agreed and reminded members that a direct charge is levied for adoption along with indirect costs for large monitors and other equipment changes. Summer asked how frequently members desired to hear about the progress of the rollout and whether she

should continue to report activities by county or all together. Consensus was to be informed of problems and after each GJ court implements.

Tina Hladik provided details about the grant funded two fingerprint identification (2FID) project being conducted with all superior courts and their CMSs statewide. She shared the goals of the project and its four objectives: replace ink and roll, verify defendant has been 10-print fingerprinted when required by law, the defendant has been charged for the correct offense, and that at least a verified fingerprint is affixed to the sentencing order. Tina described the technical solution being installed and the interaction with the vendor. Only first-year costs are covered by the grant; the ongoing cost will be \$182 per device per year. The project is nearing the implementation phase which will occur quickly, likely by the end of March. Concerns were raised that the presence of an additional device in the courtroom will obligate some courts to obtain an additional PC to connect it to and that a “no-match” will create a workflow exception for processing the case, requiring process changes at courts. Members pointed out that some courts never enter PCNs in AJACS and do not participate in ADRS. Tina clarified that the verification of correct charge which relies on the PCN falls in a later project phase.

Marretta Mathes from AOC’s Court Services Division reviewed the history of the time standards effort and creation of the related reports. She handed out a listing of 36 time standards reports, their areas of applicability, and statuses. Some types of reports require additional dependent reports not shown on the list, she said. Thirty-two reports remain to develop, test, and undergo review by the Time Standards Committee chaired by Justice Brutinel. Marretta’s goal is to wrap up work by the end of 2017. Discussion focused on the additional workload the reporting places on courts that are already strapped for resources. Marretta acknowledged the challenges and indicated that most reports will go on an annual schedule like other statistical reports. She closed by describing plans for upcoming training for judges and clerks on the reports and eliminating the bottlenecks indicated by the report results.

PROJECT UPDATE: CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Paul Thomas, court administrator for Mesa Municipal Court, announced Mesa’s production use of the CPOR interface as of December 5, 2016. He described the approach being taken to complete work on the FARE interface now that the main technical resource has been contracted for 15 hours per week in his retirement. Paul estimated 80 total resource hours remain to complete the implementation.

Adele May, the LJ CMS project manager, detailed LJ AJACS rollout progress since November, indicating that all Pinal county courts are on AJACS. The effort will now focus on Maricopa LJ courts. Adele mentioned conversion process improvements and described confusion she is clarifying regarding status codes for cases that do and do not get converted from AZTEC. Chris Hale reported that new staff members at his court have no issue with using AJACS unlike those who were present at the conversion.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

No implementations other than Pinal LJ AJACS courts, an LJ AJACS hotfix, and Mesa’s CPOR interface mentioned in the meeting have taken place since the November CACC meeting.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

Following a conversation with Cathy Clarich, the chair requested that the ERR&D project be placed on the agenda for review at the next meeting.

The next meeting will take place on **February 16, 2017 at 10:00 AM** at the State Courts Building in Phoenix. The meeting adjourned just after 11:30 a.m.